



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/541,114

06/30/2005

Marek Konstanczak

31815-101

4936

26486 7590 01/21/2009  
BURNS & LEVINSON, LLP  
125 SUMMER STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

VESRA, DINESH K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/21/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/541,114	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KONSTANCZAK, MAREK	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dinesh Vesra	<b>Art Unit</b> 3633	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dinesh Vesra. (3) Orlando Lopez.

(2) Brian Glessner. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Thiers (US Patent 6,766,622) and Moriau et al. (US Patent 6,006,486).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: No agreement was reached with respect to the current set of claims and the applicant's arguments. Applicant has agreed to further clarify the language pertaining to the bearing surfaces and their orientation in claim 1. Applicant was advised to argue why the angles disclosed in instant application are important in allowing for changes in size due to changes in humidity and temperature.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Dinesh Vesra Patent Examiner Art Unit 3633	/Brian E. Glessner/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3633
---	---